9930 है। इन संस्थानों और उनके कर्मचारियों के भविष्य के संबंध में निर्णय मामले पर बी. आई. एफ. आर. द्वारा विचार करने, रसायन उद्योग त्रिपक्षीय औद्योगिक समिति के विमर्श और इन एककों की तकनीकी व्यवहार्यता एवं आर्थिक लाभप्रदत्ता पर तथा बजटीय स्रोतों के माध्यम से निधियों की उपलब्धि पर भी निर्भर करेगा ।

Calling of details in Form-2A

1147. SHRI BEKAL UTSAHI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that details in Form-2A have been called for from a limited number of companies;

(b) if so, what are the names of those companies;

(c) on what basis were these companies identified and other companies which have not furnished these details were left out;

(d) what are the reasons for this naked discrimination and on what basis identified companies have been singled out for penal action;

(e) what are the full facts in this regard and by when discrimination would be removed ; and

(f) what are the details of Form-2A received during 1991-92 and what are the details of products, prices of which have been found justified ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN) : (a), (b), (c) and (f) No, Sir. The number of companies in the organised sector is about 250 and in the small scale sector about 8000. The number of formulations in large variety of pack sizes, based on non-s».heduled bulk drugs, is therefore enormous. The overall compliance by the companies in regard to furnishing of information mider this form as per provisions of DPCO, 1987, has not been very satisfactory. jKowever, efforts are on to improve the compliance and reminders have been/ are being sent to a large number of companies, especially thpse with reported large turn-over.

(d) There is no discrimination.

(e) Does not arise.

Termination of Services of Permanent Employees of IDPL

1148. SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2283 given in the Rajya Sabha on 12th March, 1992 and state :

(a) what is the number of permanent employees whose services were terminated out of the 8 cases, which were processed under rule 30-A and what happened to the rest of them;

(b) what are the reasons for which the company (IDPL) had to use rule 30-A in some cases and rule 25 in other cases out of 36 cases of unauthorised absence ;

(c) whether Article 14 of the Constitution was kept in mind by the management in the cases so decided ; and

(d) what are the reasons for not providing provision for appeal against adverse order passed under the amended rule 30-A ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN) : (a), (b) to (d) IDPL has reported that the services of 2 employees of Marketing Division of the company were terminated under Rule 30-A. Out of the remaining 6 employees, three reported for duty and hence no action was taken against them. One of such employees is on Medical Leave and as per the orders of the Calcutta High Court, he was sanctioned leave. The services of another employee was terminated after inquiry in terms of Rule 25 of the Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Rules, 1978. Disciplinary action against one in term of Rule 30-A is pending. This case is *sub-judice.*

Rule 25 of the Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Rules of IDPL lays down the procedure to be followed before imposing a